

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-23, 25-50, 52-78, 80-84 and 88-90 are now present in the application. Claims 85-87 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 28, 55 and 88-90 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has indicated that

1. Claims 25, 80, 88 and 90 are allowed;
2. Independent claim 89 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; and
3. Dependent claim 52 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner.

By the present amendment, in view of the foregoing amendments to independent claim 89, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 89 and its dependent claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph has been addressed. Accordingly, claims 52 and 89 are in condition for allowance.

Specification Objection

The specification stands objected to due to inappropriate incorporation of reference and the presence of embedded hyperlinks. The specification has been amended to identify the proper application number and filing date of the co-pending U.S. patent application and remove the embedded hyperlinks in paragraphs [35], [36], [38] and [53]. However, the embedded hyperlinks as shown in paragraphs [58], [68], [69], [72], [73], [75], [76] and [106] are not removed because they are not intended to be active links and are provided as examples of URLs. The Examiner's attention is drawn to MPEP 608.01, which states

“Where the hyperlinks and/or other forms of browser-executable codes are part of applicant's invention and it is necessary to have them included in the patent application in order to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and applicant does not intend to have these hyperlinks be active links, examiners should not object to these hyperlinks. The Office will disable these hyperlinks when preparing the text to be loaded onto the USPTO web database.” (emphasis added)

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 10, 13, 37, 40, 52, 65, 68 and 89 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been addressed. Accordingly, all pending claims are now definite and clear. Reconsideration

and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103

Claims 1-4, 10-11, 17, 20-22, 28-31, 37-38, 44, 47-49, 55-57, 59, 77 83, and 85-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being indefinite by Dedrick, (U.S. Patent No. 5,710,884; hereinafter as “Dedrick”). Claims 5-6, 32-33 and 60-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Nguyen (U.S. Patent No. 5,638,448). Claims 7-9 and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,546,002 B1). Claims 12-16 and 39-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Bull et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,901,287). Claims 18 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Mohan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,505,230 B1). Claims 19 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Chun et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0184527 A1). Claims 23, 50 and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Nagahara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,246 B1). Claims 26, 53, 58, 65-66, 72, 75-76 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of the article entitled “Net Security Standard from the Open Group Brings the Realization of High-Value E-Commerce for Everyone a Step Further” (hereinafter as “Net Security Standard article”). Claims 27, 54 and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of Charisius et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0077842 A1). Claims 62-

64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of the Net Security Standard article, and further in view of Kim. Claims 67-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of the Net Security Standard article, and in further view of Bull et al. Claim 73 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of the Net Security Standard article, and further in view of Mohan et al. Claim 74 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of the Net Security Standard article, and in further view of Chun et al. Claim 84 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dedrick in view of the Net Security Standard article, and further in view of Lim et al. (U.S. Patent 6,728,843 B1). These rejections, insofar as they pertain to the presently pending claims, are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. Without conceding to the propriety of the Examiner's rejections, but merely to timely advance the prosecution of the application, as the Examiner will note, independent claims 1, 28 and 55 have been amended.

Independent claim 1 now recites a combination of steps including "the utilizing step comprises retrieving, from the meta data collection, meta data that would be most appropriate for each of different contexts of using the computing device, based on at least a current role position of the user".

Independent claim 28 now recites a combination of elements including “the computer executable code configured to utilize comprises computer executable code configured to retrieve, from the meta data collection, meta data that would be most appropriate for each of different contexts of using the computing device, based on at least a current role position of the user”.

Independent claim 55 now recites a combination of elements including “the computing device retrieves, from the meta data collection, meta data that would be most appropriate for each of different contexts of using the computing device, based on at least a current role position of the user”.

Support for the above combinations of elements and steps can be found at least on page 36, paragraph 96 of the specification as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit that the above combinations of elements and steps set forth in claims 1, 28 and 55 are not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

Dedrick is directed to a system for collecting end-user profile information and using it to provide customized electronic information to an end-user. The content adapter 25 in an end-user device as shown in Fig. 2 of Dedrick modifies the electronic information (e.g., advertisements on web pages or pop-ups) based on the end-user’s profile information. However, Dedrick’s customization of information does not vary based at least on a *current role position of the user* as recited in claims 1, 28 and 55. Although the Examiner alleged that Dedrick teaches that the user can perform actions such as web browsing or buying, Dedrick’s customization of information is not based on the *role position* of the user. For instance, in Dedrick, the user’s preferred color or file format, as part of the end-user profile information that has been collected, is always used to

display all web sites for that user, regardless of whether his current role position is, *e.g.*, a private user or an employee of a company owning the computer. In other words, Dedrick's customization of information would be the same regardless of the user' role position.

In clear contrast, the presently claimed invention retrieves meta data that would be most appropriate for each of different contexts of using the computing device, *based on at least a current role position of the user*. For example, in Applicants' invention, the most appropriate meta data would be retrieved based on at least the user's current role position as, *e.g.*, a private user, an employee of the company owning the computer, etc. Therefore, the most appropriate meta data may be different when the user's current role position changes. In other words, the present invention takes the user's current role position into account in order to provide the most appropriate meta data for that particular role position of the user. This feature is clearly absent from Dedrick.

Furthermore, none of the other references applied by the Examiner correct these deficiencies of Dedrick, and thus, make the claimed invention obvious over Dedrick. Thus, even if the references were combinable, assuming *arguendo*, the combinations of references as applied by the Examiner would still fail to teach or suggest the invention as recited in claims 1, 28 and 55 since the secondary reference(s) do not teach or suggest the claimed features that are missing from Dedrick.

Accordingly, the invention as recited in claims 1, 28 and 55 and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) is patentable over the applied references, and the rejections should be withdrawn.

Application No.: 10/051,951
Art Unit: 2164

Attorney Docket No. RSW920010122US1
Amendment filed on July 21, 2005
Page 32

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09/0461 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By Esther H. Chong
Esther H. Chong
Reg. No. 40,953

EHC/GH/mmi/asc

P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000